

STAT

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040030-8

EC 60-145

✓ memo
Mr. Pierre Salinger
Press Assistant to Senator Kennedy
Room 362, Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Salinger:

Reference is made to my letter of 21 September 1960 and the attachment thereto.

Mr. Dulles has asked that I forward to you for Senator Kennedy the fourth in the series of our memoranda covering world comment on the Republican and Democratic national tickets.

Sincerely,

[Redacted]
Executive Officer

STAT

Attachment
Special Memo
No. 3, 13 Oct 60

O/DCI/[Redacted] vgd 18 Oct 60

Distribution:

orig & 1 - Addressee
1 - JSE w/o attach
✓ 1 - ER w/attach

Attachment is [Redacted] 4 - 13 October 1960
"World Comment on Republican and Democratic National Tickets"

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040030-8

EXECUTIVE REGISTER FILE



STAT

SPECIAL MEMORANDUM

WORLD COMMENT ON
REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL TICKETS

NO. 4 -- 13 OCTOBER 1960



STAT

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

COMMUNIST BLOC COUNTRIES

USSR	1
East Germany	5
Czechoslovakia	7
Hungary	8
Communist China	9

MIDDLE EASTERN COUNTRIES

Turkey	13
Iraq	16

LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Cuba	18
Dominican Republic	25
Colombia	29

NATIONALIST CHINA	30
-------------------	----

U S S R

CANDIDATES FAN ANTI-SOVIET CAMPAIGN

Moscow, Soviet North American Service in English, Sept. 21, 1960,
2300 GMT--L

(Excerpt) The member countries of the United Nations now number 96 with the admission of 14 new states Tuesday. So the U.N. General Assembly has become a still more representative forum of states. The large number of presidents and premiers who are already at the current session or are due to arrive make this an extremely important meeting and greatly enhance the prestige of the United Nations. The NEW YORK TIMES notes this editorially today, but it fails to add that the General Assembly is meeting at top level despite the opposition of the U.S. Government.

Now the men in Washington see the need to adapt themselves to the situation. In view of the unusual character of this U.N. General Assembly session, President Eisenhower has decided to address it.

Though the session is still engaged with procedure there is plenty of comment in U.N. lobbies and the press about the main problems confronting the General Assembly, disarmament in particular. Everyone is wondering what President Eisenhower will say to the assembly and what new proposals Premier Khrushchev will make. U.S. leaders up to now have avoided commenting publicly on the problems facing the assembly. President Eisenhower has said nothing. Neither have Vice President Nixon or Senator Kennedy, the two other major figures on the current American political scene.

Yet the two candidates for president have not hesitated to fan the provocative campaign against the Soviet delegation at the session. Both have made insulting anti-Soviet statements. I doubt that such talk will help Mr. Nixon's or Mr. Kennedy's chances in the November election; but one thing is certain: it is not Mr. Khrushchev who is interfering in the U.S. election campaign, as some U.S. newsmen claim. The presidential candidates are rudely interfering in the work of the Soviet delegation in the United Nations by encouraging anti-Soviet provocations in New York.

However, despite these diversionary maneuvers, U.S. leaders will have to state their views on world problems. President Eisenhower is expected to do so in his speech Sept. 22.

KENNEDY SEEKS INCREASED ARMS RACE

Moscow, in German to Germany, Sept. 21, 1960, 1951 GMT--G

(Yakov Viktorov commentary)

(Text) The laurels of his Republican rival Nixon, meritorious bearer of the cross of the cold war and current vice president, do not seem to give peace to Mr. Kennedy, U.S. presidential candidate of the Democratic Party.

This is revealed in Kennedy's television speech of Sept. 20 with which he opened a big election campaign. However, Kennedy disregarded one thing: hysterical demagoguery is a mistake in politics; it does not honor the speaker and will not convince anybody. He started with dirty slander against the Soviet policy of peace and ended with the announcement of a program which is not at all different from the bankrupt political course of the United States which he himself criticized in his speech.

To speak frankly, it would not be worthwhile to enlarge upon Kennedy's statement. It is a futile pleasure to strain all that dirt which accompanies the election campaigns in the transatlantic democracy and possibly run the risk of being reproached for interfering in the domestic affairs of the United States. Kennedy, however, was utterly tactless, because he not only slandered the Soviet Union, but also attacked the CPR. This time he tried to make his contribution to the creation of an atmosphere of cold war at the U.N. session in New York, in which certain circles of Washington are so interested that they do not even stop at using the police. It was not by chance that the press called these methods diplomatic rowdiness. Also Kennedy indulges in rowdy tricks, slandering and charging the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China with undermining peace. Needless to say, Kennedy does not furnish proof. Where would he get his factual material?

His concept seems to be that such actions as sending spy planes, torpedoing the summit, or the present military maneuvers of NATO, carried out on an unheard-of scale, serve peace. Kennedy's dirty language is confused.

Well, even Kennedy himself is confused because the nonsense which he talks reveals his own demagoguery completely. The only thing he desires is American domination of the world--not less than this, but maybe even more. Yes, maybe even more. As is revealed, he does not want to occupy second place in the cosmos but only the first place, and likewise only the first place on the moon.

In addition he disapproves of the idea that the United States was pilloried in Paris, that the President was not permitted to go to Japan, and that Nixon was received with stones in Latin America. The Republicans are no good because they tolerated such incidents. He, Kennedy, knows what must be done to change everything, to make the United States master of the world. What especially matters is to obtain as much money and authority from Congress as possible for a new armament race in order to secure for the United States nuclear superiority over all the world.

This, dear listeners, is the core of Kennedy's program. All the rest--elimination of misery, poor housing, and unemployment, aid to the farmers, and so forth--was attached to the program as pure demagoguery. Kennedy declares that if his program were not to be adopted, the United States would lose one position after the other. How right were the ancient Romans in saying, "Whom the gods would punish, they first make mad." Kennedy failed to realize that the very policy which he proclaims has inflicted loss of former positions as well as of former prestige on the United States.

And still another thing: Mr. Kennedy has tried to cast a shadow on the position of the Soviet Union in the United Nations and to support the policy of the United States. He has achieved exactly the opposite. He has blurted out the true attitude of the ruling circles in the United States which are struggling for the presidential chair. He demonstrated magnificently that this attitude has nothing in the least to do with peace nor with the desire of the peoples for disarmament.

U.S. VOTERS FACE DIFFICULT DECISION

Moscow, Soviet Home Service (Soviet Asia Program), Oct. 8, 1960,
1803 GMT--L

(Gennadiy Yuriyev commentary)

(Summary) We have begun to doubt our mental capacities, and we cannot imagine how the American voters can differentiate between Nixon and Kennedy. We have read their speeches, listened to their press conferences, and studied their programs without result.

We now have a valuable aid, though--the latest issue of TIME. Of course, you can tell by their personal mannerisms. One can imagine the following sort of discussion between two voters, one preferring Kennedy because he twitches his right leg when he is making a speech, and the other Nixon because when he is shaking hands with children his hand is like rubber.

This issue is a good guide for the voters, because otherwise--least of all by their policies--you can't tell these two "henchmen of the dollar" apart.

Both Ignore Spirit of Times

Moscow, TASS, Radioteletype in English to Europe, Oct. 8, 1960,
1848 GMT--L

(Text) The magazine INTERNATIONAL REVIEW gives a somewhat abridged version of the "great debate" between Nixon and Kennedy which took place in Chicago Sept. 26. Commenting on this debate, the magazine's special correspondent, V. Paramonov, stresses that these presidential candidates brought up by two midwives--the Republican and the Democratic parties--have no intention of taking into account the spirit of our times.

Both Lie to Negroes

Moscow, Soviet Home Service, Oct. 10, 1960, 0500 GMT--L

(Excerpts) New York--One of the most hypocritical aspects of a U.S. presential campaign, which comes every four years, is the attempt of the Democrats and Republicans to gain the support of the small percentage of Negroes who can vote. The parties pretend that they support Negro rights, including the Negro right to vote, of which millions of U.S. Negroes are systematically deprived. At the party conventions each party gave what it thought to be the surest promise of civil rights ever included in its political program.

Thus, the Democratic program says: It is time that all Americans had equal access to all fields of public life--voting, (word indistinct), employment, housing, and state office. The Republican program agreed.

But what did the two parties do after issuing these programs? At a special session of Congress after the conventions they voted against the civil rights bill. In big northern cities--New York, Chicago, Detroit, and others with a Negro population--Democrats and Republicans are flooding Negro quarters with posters and leaflets describing their candidates as friends of the Negro people.

The hypocrisy of the parties is most apparent in the south, which is traditionally a Democratic stronghold. In reality, racialists have entrenched themselves there. They use every means to stay in power, including lynching, terrorism, (word indistinct), and economic sanctions--any means which will systematically prevent the millions of southern Negroes from voting. In accordance with the complex electoral system, a presidential candidate must get a majority (of all?) states. That is why Kennedy and Nixon are trying to gain the support of southern politicians--racialists who differ only in the degree of loyalty they display toward the principle of white supremacy.

E A S T G E R M A N Y

KENNEDY SAYS U.S. WORLD PRESTIGE LOW

Berlin, East German Home Service, Sept. 26, 1960, 1810 GMT--L

(Guenther Hansel commentary)

(Excerpts) If one wants to have a say in politics nowadays, one must begin to think realistically. This afternoon, AP carried the gist of an interview with the Democratic presidential candidate, Kennedy. In this interview, Kennedy indicates that U.S. prestige had declined throughout the world. An opinion poll in 10 major U.S. cities showed that the majority of those questioned were convinced that the USSR would outstrip the United States by 1970. The lowered U.S. prestige can only be restored if the United States demonstrates a serious desire for peace, shows an understanding for the problems of other countries and, first of all, practices at home what it is preaching abroad--human rights and equality, economic progress and security.

So much for the presidential candidate, Kennedy. Indeed, dear listeners, Khrushchev's speech before the General Assembly has had a profound effect. If U.S. policy were imbued with this spirit--it is of course nowhere said that Kennedy, should he be elected, would make his own words the maxims of his policy--the basis for sincere coexistence and friendship between the peoples, for the solution of all international problems, would exist.

REPUBLICAN PARTY SUPPORTS BONN POLICY

Berlin, ADN, Radioteletype in German to East Germany, Oct. 9, 1960, 0930 GMT--L

(Report on NEUES DEUTSCHLAND article by GDR Foreign Trade Minister Rau)

(Text) Minister Rau unmasks the underlying reasons for Bonn's termination of the agreement on intra-German trade. "The West German disturber of the peace sat and sits in the dock at the U.N. General Assembly," Rau states. By terminating the agreement, the Adenauer government wants to divert attention from this fact and at the same time prevent any possible relaxation of international tension. Adenauer needs a war atmosphere to justify and speed up atomic arming. Simultaneously, the ideological prerequisites for forcing through the fascist emergency bill more easily and for foisting the intended new burdens on the masses in West Germany will be created.

Rau points out that these aims of the Adenauer government are supported by Eisenhower, Nixon, and their party. This is to be ascribed, among other things, he says, to the fact that the prices of American armament industry stocks have sunk rapidly due to the struggle for complete disarmament conducted by the Soviet Union. In recent weeks stock quotations have fallen nearly 10 billion dollars worth. "The most sacred gods of the monopoly capitalists are in danger. This is the underlying reason why U.S. imperialists have encouraged and have urged their Bonn satellite to pursue its provocative policy." Bonn's foreign minister himself revealed that, after his talk with Herter, he wrote a letter to Adenauer explaining the need to terminate the trade.

In terminating the agreement, Bonn expected the GDR to take hasty steps in reply to this provocation. "The GDR Government allows its actions in no way to be decided by Adenauer," stresses Rau. The peoples of West Europe and the entire world will also have to deal with the preparation for a war atmosphere staged by Bonn, he says. This Adenauer policy means that NATO partner De Gaulle, for example, who has recognized the Oder-Neisse frontier as final, is also to be maneuvered into military adventures to annul the Oder-Neisse frontier to the advantage of the revanchists in Bonn.

By its readiness to enter into new negotiations, promised when the agreement was terminated, Bonn wants to calm the West German economic circles which, contrary to the usual practice when economic questions are dealt with, were not consulted this time. "As Walter Ulbricht explained in the People's Chamber, we are prepared for negotiations on new agreements and are looking forward to the proposals of the Bonn government and of the West Berlin Senate," states Rau. As fresh negotiations are now to take place, agreements which correspond with the legal and factual situation and which overcome all inadequacies in the agreement of September 1951 and in the agreement of August 1960 should be made, Rau says, so that trade between the GDR and West Germany and between the GDR and West Berlin will be able to expand and develop further, without interference.

C Z E C H O S L O V A K I A

KHRUSHCHEV DRAWS CANDIDATES' FIRE

Prague in Czech to Europe, Sept. 20, 1960, 0730 GMT--L

(Jiri Cermak New York dispatch)

(Excerpt) Khrushchev's presence at the General Assembly has become one of the main topics of the American presidential campaign. The candidates of both parties are trying to surpass each other in their attacks against the USSR. Cabot Lodge, speaking for the Republicans, is boasting of his quarrels with Soviet U.N. delegates and of the firm stand he took toward Khrushchev during the latter's previous visit to the United States.

Kennedy, the Democratic candidate, has also added his bit to the anti-Soviet campaign. He promised that under his leadership the international situation would turn in favor of the United States. "We must review our policy," Kennedy said, "for it is a policy which restricts Khrushchev's movements in Manhattan, but does not prevent him from penetrating Africa, Asia, and Latin America." This statement was an open admission of the failure of American policy, for what Kennedy termed "penetration" was merely the admission that the Soviet Union has succeeded in winning the world's confidence by its policy of peaceful coexistence and mutual respect.

The American election campaign and the anti-Soviet policy of both parties clearly show that the politicians who will guide U.S. policy during the next four years have very little good will for reasonable negotiations and agreements that could lead to a relaxation in international tension. How much more correct and farsighted is the Soviet decision to transfer the most important problems to the U.N. General Assembly and to solve them in cooperation with the member states of the United Nations.

KENNEDY CRITICIZES U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Prague, Czech Home Service, Sept. 28, 1960, 2100 GMT--L

(Text) The U.S. Government directly participated in preparations for the counterrevolutionary uprising in Hungary in 1956 and in the Berlin provocations in 1953. This was openly admitted Sept. 27 in his preelection speech in Cleveland, Ohio, by the Democratic presidential candidate, Senator Kennedy. He confirmed that Eisenhower's government incited both these revolts. His criticism was, of course, not directed at Eisenhower's policy of provocation against the socialist countries, but at the fact that the government was unable to give effective help to the counterrevolutionaries.

H U N G A R Y

WEINSTOCK CRITICIZES U.S. CANDIDATES

Budapest, MTI, Radioteletype in French to Europe, Sept. 21, 1960,
0800 GMT--L

(NEPSZABADSAG article by Louis Weinstock, member of the National Committee of the U.S. Communist Party: "The American Workers and the Presidential Elections")

(Text) Nixon and Lodge as well as Kennedy and Johnson, bent on the cold war, are partisans of the position-of-strength policy and anti-communism. They have a reactionary record, and it would be wrong to support either of them. The interests of the people lie in criticizing vigorously the activity of the two parties and their candidates and stressing the need for a steadfast struggle to attain the aims of the Communist Party.

However, the Communist Party states that boycotting the elections would be a grave mistake. On the contrary, one has to take part in the electoral campaign and to demand fulfillment of the promises contained in the electoral program.

The Roosevelt traditions prove that by judiciously establishing the unity of the working masses one can impose compromises on democratic politicians. The communists take these facts into consideration and try to enlighten the masses in this regard. Nevertheless, this does not mean granting support to the Kennedy-Johnson team. On the contrary, the Communist Party severely criticizes the Democratic Party candidates and pillories their speeches, which are inspired by the cold war.

C O M M U N I S T C H I N A

CANDIDATES SLANDER SOCIALIST NATIONS

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia,
Sept. 27, 1960, 0510 GMT--W

(Excerpt) Peking, Sept. 27--Fearing that more and more nations would support the restoration of China's legal seat in the United Nations at the current session of the U.N. General Assembly, U.S. ruling quarters have recently launched a campaign of hostility and slander against China, and of opposition to the return of China's legal seat in the United Nations, according to Washington reports. Directing this campaign are U.S. Vice President Richard Nixon, who is the Republican Party's presidential candidate, and Democratic presidential candidate John F. Kennedy.

Nixon, in a statement in the latest issue of NEWSWEEK magazine, smeared China as "intensifying tension" and practicing a so-called "aggressive policy" towards the "free world." So long as there is no "basic change" in China's policy, "there can be no question of our (U.S.--NCNA) recognizing them," he howled. Defending the U.S. China policy, which is being attacked more and more widely, Nixon dished out the same old slanders against China. He alleged that China had committed "aggression against the United Nations in Korea" and "brutal suppression" of the riots in Tibet. Sticking to the U.S. imperialist policy of aggression and war, Nixon termed the Chinese people's determination to liberate their territory of Taiwan and oppose U.S. aggression against China as a Chinese attempt to "expel the United States from the Western Pacific by force."

Kennedy would not remain behind in the U.S. imperialist campaign to slander China. In a written answer to questions by the Scripps-Howard newspapers on Sept. 22, he cried that China "is a powerful and aggressive nation," that the "real question" for the United States is "what should be done about the harsh fact," and that "recognition is not the crux" of the problem. He insisted that the United States must have "a strong and successful India, a strong and successful Japan, and some kind of regional group over Southeast Asia" to "remedy the dangerous situation now existing."

Attacks on Bloc Leaders

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia,
Sept. 21, 1960, 1956 GMT--W

(Excerpts) On the eve of the opening of the U.N. General Assembly session, U.S. Vice President Nixon, the Republican presidential candidate, purposely made a speech at a gathering in Washington on

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040030-8

Monday attacking the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and advocating that the United States should continue to pursue the policy of "liberation." He alleged that there is no "freedom" in the socialist countries, and clamored for subverting them. He claimed that "freedom must be restored in the communist-bloc countries of East Europe" by the United States and that the United States "stands not just for the status quo, but for extending freedom throughout the world."

Democratic presidential candidate John Kennedy also made anti-Soviet clamors recently. He declared that he "will not promise" that the United States will "end the cold war," but "can promise" only "tireless, ceaseless effort to rebuild our strength." He said, "Strength alone can answer Mr. Khrushchev's threats and ambitions," and stressed that, during the U.N. General Assembly session, he did not think that "either one of us (Kennedy and Nixon) should meet him" (Khrushchev).

U.S. Secretary of State Herter and other officials of the State Department also seized various opportunities to make anti-Soviet statements. On Monday, Herter said that the United States refused to hold "serious negotiations" with the Soviet Union in the United Nations. He added that he considers that the idea of holding talks among the leaders of more than 80 countries in the U.N. is extremely ridiculous.

Threats Against Socialist Camp

Peking, NCNA, in Chinese Hellschreiber to the Press, Oct. 4, 1960, 1839 GMT--B

(Text) Peking, Oct. 4--According to information from New York, leading personages of the American ruling clique--such as President Eisenhower, Democratic presidential candidate Kennedy, and Under Secretary of State Dillon--have successively threatened that the United States is determined "to do whatever it can" to overthrow the people's governments of the socialist countries.

At the Sept. 30 meeting of the Polish-American Congress in Chicago, Eisenhower reiterated the criminal policy of conspiring to overthrow the socialist camp which he proposed in 1952. The United States, he stated, will "do whatever it can by peaceful means" in order that the so-called "people who are held in bondage by a tyrannical dictatorship might finally have the right to determine their own fate by their own free vote."

At the same meeting on Oct. 1, Kennedy was forced to admit that the policy of the U.S. Republican government to "free Eastern Europe" has failed. However, he clamored for adoption of the more vicious policy of encouraging a so-called "peaceful evolution" to subvert the socialist countries. Kennedy openly advocated that the next U.S. Government take

measures to encourage "internal dissension in the communist camp" and adopt the methods of so-called "economic aid and cultural exchange" to infiltrate the socialist camp, in order to pursue a "policy of patiently encouraging freedom and carefully pressuring tyranny" that "looks toward evolution, not revolution."

At the dinner of the Polish-American Congress on Oct. 2, U.S. Under Secretary of State Dillon also delivered a long speech on the cold war. Dillon imperiously declared that the United States "will never consent to the present condition in Eastern Europe but will only regard it as a nightmare before the dawn of freedom which will inevitably come." He overtly opposed a peaceful coexistence of nations of different social systems and slandered peaceful coexistence as only a "slogan" with which "Soviet imperialism" of the 20th century uses "economic pressure, political infiltration, and internal disturbance" to "conquer the world."

Kennedy Slanders Cuba

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia, Oct. 8, 1960, 2048 GMT--B

(Text) Peking, Oct. 8--U.S. Democratic presidential candidate John Kennedy, in an election speech in Cincinnati on the evening of Oct. 6, admitted that the United States has met with a most glaring failure in Cuba, according to a Washington report. At the same time, he made a most shameless, slanderous attack against the Cuban revolution.

At a dinner attended by a group of capitalists, Kennedy uttered a helpless cry with regard to the failure which U.S. imperialism has suffered in Cuba and throughout Latin America. He described this failure as a U.S. "disaster," and stated that "the great tragedy today is that we are repeating many of the same mistakes throughout Latin America." He had to admit that "grievances," "discontent," and "distrust" of the U.S. "are smoldering in almost every Latin nation."

Kennedy acknowledged that the Cuban people's hatred of the United States was aroused by the U.S. policy of plunder and suppression. He said: "We used the influence of our government to advance the interests and increase the profits of the private American companies which dominate the island's economy." He added that the United States gave stature and support to "one of the most bloody and repressive dictatorships in the long history of Latin American repression--the Batista regime." Kennedy indicated that the United States would nevertheless not give up its policy of hostility against the Cuban people in the face of its failure. In his speech, he made brazen slanders to provoke hostility against Cuba. He alleged that Cuba is being transformed into a "militant communist satellite" and "a base from which to carry communist infiltration and subversion throughout the Americas." He said threateningly, "How did we permit the communists to establish this foothold 90 miles away?"

Kennedy's speech slandering the Cuban people aroused their strong indignation. The Havana paper REVOLUCION held that Kennedy's speech constituted an "insolent threat to Cuba." The paper pointed out that this illiterate and ignorant candidate "ratified the thesis of imperialism." Another paper, EL MUNDO, pointed out that Kennedy's speech attempted to "threaten Cuba with armed aggression."

KENNEDY SEES DECLINE OF U.S. PRESTIGE

Peking, NCNA, Radioteletype in English to Europe and Asia, Oct. 10, 1960, 1705 GMT--B

(Text) Peking, Oct. 10--U.S. Democratic presidential candidate John Kennedy, in his election campaign speeches in various towns in Ohio yesterday, admitted that the debate and voting on the inclusion of China's representation on the U.N. General Assembly agenda showed that a decreasing number of countries were following the anti-China policy of the United States and that the United States was finding it ever more difficult to manipulate the voting machine of the United Nations, according to reports from New York.

Kennedy said that the voting on China's representation at the U.N. General Assembly on Oct. 8 and recent voting on some other questions were "the handwriting on the wall. I think they point the way to the road of disaster." Contradicting U.S. Vice President Nixon's statements boasting about U.S. "prestige" and "strength," Kennedy said sarcastically, "If this (U.N. General Assembly's voting on Oct. 8--NCNA) doesn't demonstrate that our prestige is not increasing, if this doesn't demonstrate that the United States is not growing in power, I'd like to know what does."

Depressed at the defeat of the U.S. policy of hostility toward China in the United Nations, Kennedy said that this "most directly affected the power, prestige, and influence of the United States."

On the same day, U.S. Democratic National Chairman Henry Jackson said that the U.N. General Assembly's voting on Oct. 8 indicated that "the United States failed for the first time to get a majority in the United Nations." He thought that this testified to the lowering of U.S. "prestige" and "completely shatters Mr. Nixon's claim that communist prestige in the world is at an all-time low and American prestige is at an all-time high." Particularly concerned about the unpopularity of the U.S. anti-China policy among the African countries, Jackson said apprehensively: "Even more ominous for the future is the fact that we did not win a single vote of any of the new African nations."

T U R K E Y

CAMPAIGN ISSUES, TACTICS ANALYZED

Ankara, Turkish Home Service, Sept. 25, 1960, 1800 GMT--M

(Summary) The election campaign has been accelerated in the United States. The two contestants for the White House, Nixon and Kennedy, have entered an exhausting period of activity. Last week Democratic candidate Kennedy delivered 38 speeches and held 6 press conferences. In spite of a bad knee, Nixon has toured 25 states during the past two weeks.

"The two young candidates are doing all they can to win and at times even use methods which are not quite fair. One of these is the exploitation of issues related to religion, because Kennedy is a Catholic. Up to now the White House occupant has always been a Protestant. For the first time, a Catholic candidate with a strong chance to win has emerged, and he needs Protestant votes to win. If the Protestants are provoked into not voting for a Catholic, Republican candidate Nixon would benefit. This, of course, is not a fair attitude. Though Nixon has instructed his fellow campaigners to make no reference to religious issues, many Protestant clergymen, and in the words of a famous writer, "some local political lumpfish," are exploiting the religious issue.

"As an example let us quote the words of a clergyman, Dr. (Criswell?). 'Catholicism is not a religion; it is political despotism. It is a political system which has enveloped the whole world like an octopus and which threatens the basic principles for which our forefathers gave their lives. Even if Kennedy were to win the election by stressing that the church and state are two separate entities, eventually, as a Catholic, he would have to recognize the superiority of this church to all other churches in the United States. Thus religious freedom would die in the United States.' It will be seen that this minister, by stating that if Kennedy wins, Protestantism would disappear, is fully exploiting the religious issue." It is reported that hundreds of thousands of copies of this sermon have been distributed in the southern states. "And in many other places, some Protestant ministers have established local groups and are preparing for a struggle against Catholicism by taking a common oath."

"Along with this religious exploitation, which is incompatible with morality and fair play, the usual electoral demagoguery is in full swing. The presidential candidates are trying to treat various groups as it would please them. For example, winning the vote of the 4.5 million Jewish population, most of whom reside in New York, depends on the attitude adopted toward Israel. So the two presidential

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040030-8

candidates, when addressing Jewish associations, have to state that they would definitely solve the Arab-Israeli disagreement. They are saying it and are meeting with strong protests on the part of Arab organizations in the United States.

"The Negro vote, which exceeds 15 million, is also of utmost importance. To win this vote, both attachment to human rights and sympathy for the black African countries must be shown. Nixon, somewhat irregularly, provided scholarships for African students to demonstrate his sympathy for the black race, and Kennedy has sent a representative to Africa.

"All this is usual in an election campaign. The thing that is basically important is the attitude of the two candidates toward world affairs. For this reason, compared with previous elections, this campaign is very interesting and is being conducted on a high level. America is at a turning point. The reason for this is the rapid military, economic, political, and strategic growth of the Soviet Union, which each day carries more weight on the world scene. In order not to lose its supremacy in the face of this Soviet threat, America must adjust itself and know how to direct its policies toward new goals. In fact, America, which after World War II almost reluctantly became the leader of the free nations, experienced difficulties in playing this role. The people (were used to?) America's traditional policy of impartiality; they were unable to conform to the worldwide responsibilities which had emerged. This situation created tension and dissension in American elections."

The difficult task of reconciling the American nation and making it realize its international responsibilities fell to Eisenhower. Eisenhower did reconcile the nation, but during the eight years of his administration he has failed to tackle seriously the question of counteracting the ever-increasing strength and influence of the Soviet Union.

"Since the United States is understood to be lagging behind in launching rockets, conquering space, and in waging missile competition, the free world leader cannot claim a great change in the country. This task is now facing the young leaders and this is where the greatest importance of the election campaign lies. The United States must make certain that it advances more rapidly than the communist world in the military and economic fields, and that it maintains this supremacy."

Kennedy, who has set up a general staff embodying the best brains of the United States, claims that the development of the economies of the Western powers has been very slow during the past eight years. He says: "The rate of development in the United States has been kept as low as 2 percent. Although the standard of living in the

Soviet Union is much lower than that in the United States, the Soviet Union has managed to establish a high tempo of development and surpassed the United States in the fields of missiles and education. While the United States manufactures millions of cars every year and spends billions of dollars for the satisfaction of luxury demands, it has failed to build adequate schools and has lagged behind in the missile competition.

"Even if it is the richest country in the world, with the greatest resources, the United States can continue to preserve world leadership only through rapid economic progress and through investing huge sums in the fields of education and defense. The free world has linked its fate with the progress of the United States. The free world can only survive if the United States continues to maintain its supremacy. Therefore, the entire free world is closely concerned about a new drive in the American economy, with the rapid elimination of its shortcomings in the fields of education and defense. These are the views of Democratic candidate Kennedy." Kennedy believes in vast investments by the state in the fields of education and defense. He also wants to increase production 100 percent.

Compared with this bold attitude on the part of Senator Kennedy, Vice President Nixon, who shares the responsibilities of the present administration, is faced with the necessity of defending the past. He is trying to show that Kennedy's arguments are unfounded and that the United States is advancing in all fields. But famous writer Joseph Alsop clearly states that all these speeches are electioneering propaganda, and that both Kennedy and Nixon share the same views. "If this point of view is correct, then the election results will be of no importance."

"But whoever wins the elections, be it Nixon or Kennedy, American policy, which is at a turning point, is reaching new stages where it will have to counteract the ever increasing Soviet danger in the military, economic, political, and strategic fields."

Tomorrow, for the first time in U.S. history, both candidates will face each other on the television screen and express their views. Three or four such debates will be held in this manner and 100 million Americans will watch them.

"According to the party to which he belongs, Kennedy stands a better chance. The number of supporters of Kennedy's party is 7 or 8 million more than the rival party. As a matter of fact, for the past three terms the Democrats have won elections to the Senate and the House of Representatives quite comfortably. Of 50 state governors, 34 are Democrats. Being the candidate of the stronger party is not enough to win the White House competition. The personality of the candidate plays a vital part. From this point of view, Nixon stands as good a chance as Kennedy."

Approved For Release 2002/11/13 : CIA-RDP80B01676R000900040030-8

I R A Q

PARTIES COMPETING FOR ZIONIST VOTES

Baghdad, Iraqi Home Service, Sept. 22, 1960, 1900 GMT--M

(Excerpts) In their electoral campaign, both American parties--the Democratic and the Republican--are now competing for the friendship of Zionism and Israel. They compete in giving guarantees for the survival of Israel and prolongation of the cancer created by imperialism. Nixon and Kennedy compete to gain the votes which they regard as an important factor deciding the presidential election. They compete in praising Israel and considering it the bastion of peace in the Middle East. The Democratic and the Republican candidates are competing in praising what they call "the Jewish people" and in admiring their attempts to establish a new civilization in the Middle East.

This is what Nixon and Kennedy have said and this is affirmed, of course, by American policy, which runs between the currents of these two parties. This is also stated by the imperialist circles and the satellites which revolve in the orbit of this policy and implement it submissively and obediently. The Arabs have learned from the previous American electoral campaigns that the promises made by the candidates to Israel and Zionism were implemented and applied. They were prearranged agreements to give more support and assistance to Israel so that it could carry on with its criminal aggressive policy.

At whose expense is all this done? At the expense of what victim is America inclining more and more to the support of Israel? At the expense of no one except the Arabs. Yes, at the expense of the Arabs, who are displaced from their home, Palestine, at the expense of the Arab peoples who are threatened by Zionism and imperialism, at the expense of the national liberation movement which is flaming in the various parts of the Arab homeland.

Imperialism today is furiously increasing its aggression against the Arab peoples and is taking Israel as a base for its aggression. This feature becomes more clear as the struggle of the Arab countries for the liquidation of imperialism and the restoration of usurped Palestine intensifies. Therefore the Arabs should realize that every battle they fight is a battle against imperialism.

What, after all this, does American policy want? What does it want.

arms and experts through NATO to annihilate people who fight for their dignity and freedom? Yes, what does it want, after all this? It appears that American policy does not take heed of events, of what more aid to Israel will lead to.

The Arab people will no longer be deceived. These people have one road--the road of their solidarity and independence so they themselves can take over the duty of rescuing themselves from imperialism, protecting their freedom and liberating their usurped parts--Algeria, Oman, and Palestine. The shadow of Israel will vanish with that of imperialism. The vanguards of the Palestine liberation army will take over their duties inside Palestine, to put an end to the imperialist bastion of Israel and to establish the republic of the Arab people of Palestine. Then the American statesmen will make bargains at the expense of their own people and not at the expense of other peoples.

Kennedy Statement Protested

Baghdad, Iraqi Home Service, Sept. 22, 1960, 1100 GMT--M

(Text) The IRAQI NEWS AGENCY has learned that the Iraqi Foreign Ministry has handed a note to the American embassy in Baghdad drawing attention to a speech delivered by Mr. Kennedy, the Democratic Party presidential candidate in the United States. The note said it is truly painful that electioneering propaganda should be exploited for the purpose of harming the Arabs and their legal rights and for supporting the usurping group which continues committing crimes against the rights of the peaceful Palestinian Arabs, a group responsible for displacing one million Arab refugees, a group which flouts the U.N. resolutions concerning the return of the refugees to their country and their compensation for their property.

The Iraqi Foreign Ministry note states that the course which certain presidential candidates in the United States have adopted undoubtedly affects American-Arab relations. The Iraqi Foreign Ministry asserts that this stand is not in the interest of relations between the Iraqi Republic and the United States.

The ministry has asked that the American embassy act as a medium for the American quarters concerned with a view to clarifying the ill effects caused by Kennedy's speech.

C U B A

NIXON, KENNEDY VIE IN SILLY STATEMENTS

Havana, Radio Mambi, in Spanish to Cuba, Sept. 22, 1960, 2330 GMT--F

(Summary) Nixon is making a desperate effort to gain the favor of all the reactionaries in his country and to swing to his side the hierarchs of the U.S. plutocracy who have been terrified by the enthusiastic welcome that the humble people have accorded Fidel Castro. In an attempt to win at any cost, the Republicans are ready to make all sorts of ridiculous accusations.

Yesterday Nixon accused Kennedy of being a virulent laborist and an intolerable trade unionist. The curious thing is that the Republicans accused Kennedy of being a millionaire and a "playboy" when the presidential campaign started. Now they are accusing him of just the opposite. Things must be bad in the United States when the heir to 400 million dollars--ill-gained, of course--is accused of being the protector of the lowly workers.

Meantime, determined to prove that he is just as silly as anyone else, Kennedy asked for more armaments in a speech he delivered in Tennessee. He did so at the very moment that Khrushchev arrived in New York with his plan for complete disarmament.

KENNEDY ATTACKED IN CASTRO SPEECHES

Havana, Cadena Oriental, in Spanish to Cuba, Sept. 28, 1960, 0100 GMT--E

(Editor's Note: The following passages from Fidel Castro's Sept. 27 speech to the U.N. General Assembly were quoted by Cuban correspondent Salvador Garcia Aguiro in a commentary on the speech)

(Excerpts) Now we wish to highlight some parts of Fidel's speech. For example, when he alluded to the threats of aggression upon Cuba made by Admiral Burke and Senator Bridges, among others, Fidel said: "We must here and now declare, in the first place, that these mouthpieces about attacks are for the purpose of creating hysteria and readying the conditions necessary to mount an attack against our country. We have never spoken, we have never said a single word that would imply the idea of any type of attack upon the Guantanamo naval base. We are the first ones interested in not giving the imperialists a pretext to commit aggression against us. We hereby declare this once and for all, but we also declare that, from the instant that base becomes a threat to our people, our revolutionary government is seriously considering requesting, within the canons of international law, the evacuation of the naval and military forces of the Government of the United States."

"We must be alert against falsehood and treachery. Mr. Kennedy's statements are enough to shock anyone. Referring to Cuba, he says: 'We must use all the strength of the OAS to prevent Castro's interference in other Latin American governments and reestablish freedom in Cuba.' They are going to reestablish freedom in Cuba!

"We must affirm our opinion," Kennedy continues, "and our intention not to allow the Soviet Union to convert Cuba into its Caribbean base, and apply the Monroe Doctrine."

"Imagine this candidate talking about the Monroe Doctrine in the middle of the twentieth century!

"He also speaks about the Guantanamo problem. He is the third one to broach the subject. And he talks about supporting the forces against Castro in exile and in the mountains of Cuba.

"'Communism must be contained,' he says, 'before it has a chance to spread.' If Kennedy weren't an illiterate, ignorant millionaire he would know that you can't make a revolution against the people with the support of the landlords."

(Editor's Note: On Sept. 30, Fidel Castro appeared on the Havana CMP Television Network's "Meet the Press" program at about 0545 GMT and, in the course of an account of his impressions of the United States, observed that the two presidential candidates are "both young, beardless men. They are ignorant and illiterate; they are cowards. They look like two boys of the great vested interests.")

KENNEDY IS TARGET OF PERSONAL ABUSE

Havana, Cadena Oriental, in Spanish to Cuba, Sept. 30, 1960, 1830 GMT--F

(Summary) Kennedy, the illiterate and ignorant millionaire, said in Ohio yesterday that a Democratic administration will never accept the idea that socialism is the final solution in Eastern Europe. Nixon has been saying the same thing. The Republican administration will never accept the idea of the end of capitalist exploitation in Eastern Europe, either.

It happens, however, that the people of those countries are constructing socialism whether the U.S. Republicans and Democrats approve of it or not. Kennedy's words reveal the imperialist policy of interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries. Who do these Yankees think they are that they can accept or refuse to approve the socialist regimes in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America?

Open Letter to Kennedy

Havana, Radio Mambi, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 7, 1960, 2330 GMT--F

(Summary) Open letter to an illiterate millionaire: Mr. John F. Kennedy, candidate to the U.S. presidency, Boston, the privileged city, United States.

Scornful Mr. Kennedy: For some time now we have been following your political trajectory in your attempt to replace that decrepit and stupid old man who answers to the name of Caesar Attila Caligula Eisenhower I, on the throne of the Yankee empire.

A terrible curse must have fallen on the suffering U.S. people when they have to be ruled by mediocre men and cretins. It seems to us that it must be great anguish for the U.S. people to have to choose between you and Nixon to find a substitute for an old imbecile and golf player. It pains us to see a people, once ruled by George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, being forced to choose between you, the representative of sterility, and Mr. Nixon, the representative of social obscurantism.

Of course, there is another choice left to the United States, namely the road of the liberating revolution, but unfortunately the people cannot see this road because the most despicable organized propaganda in the history of the world keeps them in the dark.

We understand, Mr. Kennedy, that you must preach your slimy lies to achieve your aim, and we also understand that you are obliged to keep your people blindfolded until you achieve that aim. We justify to a certain extent your action in engaging in a debate with Mr. Nixon, the man whom the wrinkled and trembling finger of the present emperor singled out as your opponent. But what we cannot justify and approve, idiot Mr. Kennedy, is that you use Cuba's name in your political maneuvers and, stupid Mr. Kennedy, we are not going to keep quiet while you attack our country from your mercenary rostrum, as you did yesterday in Cincinnati.

Cuba has just the kind of government that the Cubans want, miserable Mr. Kennedy, and we do not believe that you have been able to concentrate in all your meetings the fourth part of the people whom our leaders are able to concentrate at any one time and without any previous notice. You should also know, Mr. Kennedy, that the Cubans like the North Americans more than you think they do.

You are nothing else, you imbecile, than a piece of the yoke that oppresses the U.S. people, a link of the heavy chain that is enslaving the U.S. people, idiotic Mr. Kennedy, and we hope that they can get rid of their yoke and chains. The Cubans, mercenary Mr. Kennedy, wish to see the North Americans free--free of their chains and free of the terrible war threat that hangs over them. You were wrong, you cretin, in saying that Fidel has exploited the twin themes of human misery and hatred for the Yankees in Latin America. Understand this, unhappy Mr. Kennedy, that the hunger prevalent in Latin America is much older than Fidel and that the hatred for the Yankees was sown in our lands by the old Kennedys who exploited our peoples for tens of years. The hunger and the human misery that prevail in poor America are the results of that old policy by which you stand. The hatred of which you speak is directed against those who, like you, are the heirs to enormous fortunes amassed with the sweat and blood of the unfortunate underdeveloped people of the world. No, most stupid Mr. Kennedy, Fidel is not to blame for it.

The misery and the hatred are there because you yourselves sowed them throughout the world. But do not worry, imbecile Mr. Kennedy, the misery and hatred will not remain much longer because the people are liberating themselves and soon they will remove their blindfolds, achieve their final liberation, and expel every Kennedy, Nixon, and Eisenhower. In another part of your inopportune speech you say that you have a program to rid America of communism and you assured your listeners that your program will stop Castro's tyranny and that this tyranny will finally perish in the streets of Havana.

As for the presence of communism in America, we shall say nothing about it because no one in Cuba or even Harlem believes that fairy tale. As to your warning that our revolution will perish in the streets of Havana, thanks to your miraculous program, we would like very much to have you, miserable and despicable Mr. Kennedy, take charge of the expedition. We would like to have you come so that we can hang you by your tongue from the highest point of the monument to those who died in the Maine disaster--men who died for God knows what, Mr. Kennedy. Come, cowardly Mr. Kennedy, so that you can see with your own eyes a people who have what they need to face despicable and miserable dogs like you and those who follow you when you come to exterminate the revolution in the streets of Havana. Come next year, perhaps, stolid Mr. Kennedy, the year in which we plan to wipe illiteracy from our country, and maybe you can profit by it and learn to read and write yourself.

Backing of Counterrevolutionaries

Havana, CMQ Television Network, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 7, 1960,
1815 GMT--F

(Excerpts) Senator Kennedy's statements prove that the young senator was correctly rated by Fidel Castro in his famous speech to the United Nations and that the Democratic candidate really knows nothing at all about the present or past Cuban situation. Moreover, he is influenced by his and his family's interests--and his words show it--and certainly this is not a good recommendation for a man who aspires to rule in the White House. When Kennedy said a week ago that he would help the counterrevolutionaries in Cuba and those who attacked us from the United States, he enunciated a policy as contrary to international law as the one enunciated by President Eisenhower on the occasion of the U-2 incident.

It seems that the young senator is absolutely ignorant of the rules of conduct observed between nations and the principles of international morals. Coming from the mouth of a presidential candidate, these words are dangerous, because Mr. Kennedy may enter the White House and, if the United States should act as illegally and immorally as Mr. Kennedy thinks it should, it can cause disturbances in the world and even destroy the peace because it is a powerful nation.

No one should be surprised by the fact that Senator Kennedy reaches such deplorable extremes when he talks about Cuba, because there are enough indications in financial circles that the Cuban revolution has affected both him and his family, as, for example, when the Cuban electric and telephone companies were nationalized. These two companies were connected to the Lehman brothers' bank, through which the millionaires of the Democratic Party invest their money. This is the reason why Senator Kennedy, who finds President Eisenhower's policy in Latin America so wrong, agrees with the economic aggressions that the Washington government has been waging against us. As far as we are concerned, I think that we should thank Mr. Kennedy for having told us in advance what we can expect of him so that we can prepare ourselves to meet all future contingencies.

Cincinnati Speech on Cuba

Havana, Cadena Oriental, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 7, 1960, 1630 GMT--F

(Summary) Kennedy has had something to say about our revolution. Speaking in Cincinnati, the Democratic candidate has repeated the usual calumnies about Cuba that AP and UPI daily broadcast to the world.

Kennedy, the faithful parrot, has also repeated what Eisenhower, Herter, Burke, and the other presidential candidates have said and are saying. This should prove that the presidential election in the United States

is only a matter of form and that both Nixon and Kennedy think the same and that both will continue the aggressive policy of the U.S. government, once in power.

Kennedy, who was unmasked by Fidel during the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly, has proved that he had no political knowledge and that, moreover, he is an illiterate and ignorant person. His speech in Cincinnati was almost entirely devoted to Cuba. He spoke about the need of U.S. friendship for Cuba; he said that the United States should try to understand the Cuban problems; he said that Cuba will be free again. Then he made the dire prediction that Castro's tyranny will die in the streets of Havana. Were we not so indignant about what he said, we would laugh at the whole thing.

We would like to ask Kennedy how he is going to destroy our revolution; perhaps with landings similar to the one attempted a few days ago? Does Kennedy know that any aggression against our country is condemned to failure because our revolution is supported by our people? What friendship for Cuba does Kennedy speak about; the one that the United States showed for Cuba during 50 years? We do not want such friendship and we shall not accept it. And what friendship has the United States shown for us since the advent of our revolution?

Kennedy is simply being cynical when he speaks about the U.S. friendship for Cuba and when he says that the Cuban people will be free again. We are free, Mr. Kennedy, and we shall continue being free, because we are determined to be so and because we have the means with which to be so. We were not free before our revolution because the orders came from the Yankee embassy and not from our government. Yet in a sense our people did have some freedom then: they were free to starve to death and to accept the exploiters imposed on us. Our revolution will not perish in the streets of Havana, as you say, Mr. Kennedy, but what will perish in the streets of Havana will be the traitors, the mercenaries, and the marines who may dare to land here.

Endorsement of Monopolists

Havana, Union Radio Network, in Spanish to Cuba, Oct. 7, 1960, 1730 GMT--F

(Summary) Mr. Kennedy spoke on Cuba last night. The subject is too big for such a small lad, even though they tell us that he spent three hours in his hotel suite preparing the speech. We really do not care whether Kennedy, or Nixon, or Eisenhower speaks because they constitute a trio with the same tone of voice and the same imperialist accompaniment. Unfortunately, the U.S. workers, the farmers, the Negroes, and the downtrodden do not have much choice, because neither candidate gives them any hope.

The brainless senator said last night that he did not disagree with President Eisenhower's policy. The fact is that while the economy of the U.S. people is showing a downward trend, the profits of the monopolists are increasing by leaps and bounds, steel is being imported, ships are being made in foreign shipyards, and the import of foreign cars is increasing. What does all this mean? It means that while the U.S. workers are unemployed the monopolists make more profits, because what they import from abroad costs them less since the wages in foreign countries are lower than in the United States.

For example, when we hear that 668,000 foreign-made cars have been imported by the United States, we would think that General Motors, the Ford Motor Company, and the Chrysler Corporation are losing money. That is not true, because these companies have their own plants abroad where they make these imported cars. What is the result? Their profits are higher because the wages they pay the foreign workers, as we have said, are lower than the wages paid in the United States. The monopolies have no country, as you know.

Speech Unworthy of Comment

(Editor's Note) Havana's Cadena Oriental radio on Oct. 7 at 1800 GMT carried an abusive review of Senator Kennedy's Cincinnati speech by Jose Pardo Llado. The commentator punctuated quotations from the speech with "blah, blah, blah" and concluded that it was hardly necessary for him to "comment on the dumb John's statements," since "who invited Kennedy to give his opinions about Cuba?" He observed that "this Kennedy is a jackass; how can one reply to the heehaws issuing from such an ass?" With rising vehemence, Pardo Llado shouted, "These millionaire gringos think we are slaves!" Then, stating that the subject is unworthy of his indignation, the commentator concluded that "our only answer, our only reply, is an eloquent, sonorous, loud Bronx cheer," and he provided the appropriate sound effects.

D O M I N I C A N R E P U B L I C

KENNEDY AWARE OF U.S. SHORTCOMINGS

Ciudad Trujillo, La Voz Dominicana, in Spanish to the Dominican Republic, Sept. 19, 1960, 1100 GMT--E

(Summary) John F. Kennedy, the dynamic, angry Democratic presidential candidate, is a man who likes to call a spade a spade. He is a fighting man whose words and actions can be very helpful in remedying the errors, ineptitude, and weakness which have caused the United States to lose the world leadership which the last world war placed in its wealthy hands. Kennedy is not shortsighted and he is aware of reality. The Democratic candidate has watched the collapse of the material and moral power of the United States and apparently he realizes the reasons for this collapse.

Although he has not personally felt--as Nixon did--the insults of Latin American crowds, he is aware of the falling prestige of the United States among the Iberian peoples of America and he must have analyzed objectively the causes which have led to this situation. Kennedy is aware of the dangerous Russian interference in the Caribbean area and communist belligerence in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. He therefore finds the White House Order restricting Khrushchev to Manhattan ridiculous, ineffectual, and stupid.

Kennedy in all of his speeches emphasizes one basic fact--the necessity for the United States to recover the strength it has lost during the administration of Eisenhower, a victorious military leader who could never grasp the political realities of the present time, absorbed as he has been in the golf course and advised as he has been by mediocre, indecisive men.

This recovery of U.S. strength cannot be limited to specific military gains in the perfecting of rockets, in a greater number of atomic submarines, in an increased number of bases surrounding the dangerous potential enemy. The strength of a nation, under present circumstances, is not limited to the effectiveness of its war materiel; it is also essential to have the strong friendship of other nations, particularly neighbor nations which can fit into the U.S. economic machinery in foreseeable days of emergency.

Such friendship is achieved by seeing that justice is done, abandoning anachronistic positions of tutelage, turning against the agitators who have infiltrated high North American government circles. He who wins the coming elections must seek to erase the injustice, mistakes, and misunderstandings left by the ineptitude and the chronic shortsightedness of Christian Herter.

The Dominican Republic, too, expects corrections. It is not a beggar. These corrections are needed to do justice to our government and our people, who have always supported pan-American ideals.

VISION Article Reviewed

Ciudad Trujillo, La Voz Dominicana, in Spanish to the Dominican Republic, Sept. 30, 1960, 1100 GMT--E

(Summary) The magazine VISION, a New York Spanish-language publication, will publish in its October issue an important article by Senator John F. Kennedy, U.S. Democratic presidential candidate.

Our exclusive UPI service has furnished us with an advance copy of the text of this work. In it Senator Kennedy arrives at the wise conclusion that the present Washington Republican administration has since 1952 remained indifferent to the problems of Latin America. After referring to Roosevelt's successful good-neighbor policy, Senator Kennedy points out that the United States has since become the target of attacks from Latin America. However, he concludes, with good will this situation can be corrected. The peoples of America must become not only good neighbors, but partners to develop the vast potential of the Western Hemisphere.

The Dominican Republic, barbarically sacrificed at the sixth conference of foreign ministers in San Jose, Costa Rica, by U.S. Secretary of State Herter, who was following Romulo Betancourt's orders, welcomes the important declarations made in the article by Senator Kennedy.

Whether this great politician or his strong opponent, Nixon, wins, it is in any case evident that the new President of the United States will have to take immediate measures to correct the great mistakes committed by the outgoing administration. We trust that the new U.S. Government will restore with the Dominican Republic the policy of good will and mutual support to which our country has been constantly faithful in the past 30 years.

RESTORATION OF U.S. LEADERSHIP SOUGHT

Ciudad Trujillo, La Voz Dominicana, in Spanish to the Dominican Republic, Sept. 30, 1960, 1100 GMT--E

("Lack of Leadership," by Javier Montes)

(Summary) Both of the U.S. presidential candidates in their speeches emphasize that the United States must regain world leadership if it does not want communism to conquer the world. Kennedy says that the United States must recover the initiative in Hispano-America,

in Asia, and Africa. We must regain world leadership to face communism, Nixon proclaims. Although the words sound strange from Nixon, since his party has been in power for the past 8 years and is responsible for the present lack of leadership he now demands, they nevertheless reveal the supreme aspiration of the Americans to regain the leadership of the free world, which expects from them not only economic and technical aid but moral guidance.

It is evident that the United States has lost the post of command, particularly here in Latin America, in Bogota, Lima, Santiago, Buenos Aires, Sao Paulo, Havana, and Caracas, where an anti-Yankee xenophobia has arisen such as has not been known since the days of General Sandino. What has made the United States so unpopular among the peoples of the hemisphere? The main reason is indubitably the inconsistency of the United States' policy toward Hispano-America. There are many things which separate the Hispano-Americans from the United States, but there is much that unites them, too. The nations of this continent have always looked to the north for the leadership they now lack. The fact is that if the United States knew us better it would act differently. It is because of its ignorance of what we are and what we can become that the United States has lost its bearings in Hispano-America. Will Kennedy or Nixon be able to find the way again?

NEW PRESIDENT SHOULD HEED PAPAL ADVICE

Ciudad Trujillo, La Voz Dominicana, in Spanish to the Dominican Republic, Oct. 1, 1960, 1100 GMT--E

(Editorial: "Comforting Message from His Holiness the Pope")

(Excerpt) Pope John XXIII, in his most important statement to date, has expressed concern over the present world situation and has urged the faithful in all parts of the world to pray for peace. The supreme leader of Christianity has said that he will pray especially for heads of state--those persons so highly placed by Providence and entrusted with great responsibilities in national and international assemblies--so that they may safeguard liberty and justice.

The Christian world is suffering a severe crisis and is marching down the path of discord. A sad example of this is the very America in which we live. We remember the unjust agreement arrived at in the sixth meeting of foreign ministers at San Jose, an agreement condemning the Dominican Republic--a nation in which there are proportionally

more true Catholics than in any other nation in Latin America. Heads of state who backed the legal monstrosity of San Jose did not heed the Pope's appeal that liberty and justice be safeguarded. Rather, they contributed to the weakening of hemispheric solidarity and encouraged communist infiltration in the New World, which is now the "continent of hope" for Moscow and Peking.

The papal message is opportune in view of the coming elections in the United States. It is hoped that the message will be heeded by the next president of the United States, particularly if the victor should be Kennedy, a man of definite Catholic affiliation. We trust that the wise words of the Pope will inspire meditation on means of arriving at a peaceful solution to the problems which beset the world and painfully divide our America.

C O L O M B I A

KENNEDY SPEECH RECALLS ROOSEVELT ERA

Cali, Circuito Todelar, in Spanish to Colombia, Oct. 10, 1960, 1730 GMT--P

(Text) Senator John F. Kennedy, the Democratic Party's candidate for the presidency of the United States, is waging an active campaign leading up to the elections which will be held a month from now in the United States--an election on whose results will depend the new orientation of the first world power located in our own hemisphere.

In his speeches, one following almost on the heels of the other, the Democratic candidate has heaped criticism on the foreign policy conducted by the present president, General Eisenhower, in the name of the Republican Party. But Mr. Kennedy had never been so emphatic before his supporters and listeners as he was in his speech in Cincinnati, when he referred to the cause of Latin America and particularly to Cuba and its revolutionary movement.

For the thousands of inhabitants of this area of the world who have suffered from the effects of a policy which, since the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has cast off the principles of good neighborliness and friendship to follow paths not always in accord with the standards of democracy and national dignity, Senator Kennedy's declarations throw a ray of light on the national horizon. For the Democratic candidate publicly recognizes, with all the authority of his position as an active U.S. senator and a party spokesman, that the U.S. Government has committed grave errors in such hemispherically important matters as the relations with these countries, and that a change in current policies is imperative.

Senator Kennedy's words stem from a background of solid facts, since they are based on reports supplied the Republican administration by experts and impartial observers, as well as on the actual events which have transpired before the eyes of the world--events which have not left the announced and oft-repeated spirit of solidarity and friendship allegedly existing among the governments and peoples of the American states in an enviable position.

That spirit was a reality under the good-neighbor policy but, as we said before, it was abandoned with the passing of the great Democratic leader of America and the world--President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Furthermore, since thought must be given to the good will of the Latin American peoples in the campaign to elect the president of the United States, there is no doubt that Senator Kennedy can now proclaim that he counts on that good will in seeking to become the occupant of the White House during the next four years.

NATIONALIST CHINA

TAIPEI REFUTES KENNEDY VIEWS ON QUEMOY

Taipei, in English to Japan and Korea, Oct. 13, 1960, 1005 GMT--W

(Summary) President Chiang Kai-shek told a visiting American correspondent recently that the Republic of China will under no circumstances give away any of the offshore islands it now holds. The President's remarks were the first official reaction from the Chinese Government to the statement made by John F. Kennedy that the offshore islands should not be included in the U.S. defense line.

Authoritative sources in Taipei, commenting on Sen. Kennedy's statement, declared that Free China will fight to the death to defend the offshore islands. Without Quemoy and Matsu, there will be no Taiwan or Pescadores, they maintain. No one in Free China wants to interfere in the domestic issues of their American ally, but Quemoy and Matsu are part of Chinese territory. It has been proved that the nation has the capabilities to defend the offshore islands, and these islands are an integral part of the defense line of Free China.

The sources maintained that the security of Taiwan would be seriously threatened without the offshore islands. For the communists, the capture of the offshore islands is a stepping stone to the eventual assault on Taiwan itself.

These sources also warned that Senator Fulbright's observation on admitting Communist China to the United Nations borders on appeasement. His contention that the Peking regime would behave itself after being admitted to the United Nations is wishful thinking. The U.S. Government has negotiated with the Peking regime both in Geneva and in Warsaw, and the conduct of the Communist Chinese has not changed one iota. Where is the assurance that they will change their conduct after being admitted into the United Nations? The communists are not worthy of being admitted to the United Nations. Their admission to the world body will destroy it, but will not reform the communists.